



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,111	09/12/2003	Leif Stefan Kirschenbaum	IBM1P040/SJ09-2003-0032US	9096
28875	7590	01/26/2005	EXAMINER	
Zilka-Kotab, PC P.O. BOX 721120 SAN JOSE, CA 95172-1120			NGUYEN, CHAU N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2831	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

10/662,111

Applicant(s)

KIRSCHENBAUM, LEIF STEFAN

Examiner

Chau N Nguyen

Art Unit

2831

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/12/03.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Claims 27-37 in the reply filed on Dec. 10th 2004 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not provide a detailed description to support the claimed subject matter of "the first and second electrical contacts being exposed via a quick type connector". Specifically, it is unclear to how the first and second electrical contacts are exposed by means of a quick type

connector. As shown in the drawings, the first and second electrical contacts are exposed themselves and contact each conductor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 27-29, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maeda (6,020,559).

Maeda discloses an electrical cable (Figures 1-3) comprising a flexible sheath having first and second ends, multiple conductors embedded in the sheath, for each conductor, first and second electrical contacts in communication with the conductor, and for each conductor, a third electrical contact in communication with the conductor (col. 3, lines 11-13, lines 29-34, lines 43-45, and lines 51-56) (re claim 27). Maeda also discloses the first and second electrical contacts being positioned on opposite sides of the sheath (re claim 28), the first and second electrical contacts being positioned directly opposite each other relative to the sheath (re claim 29). Re claims 34 and 35, the recitation of an element being

"adapted to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchison*, 69 USPQ 138.

6. Claims 27 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Noro et al. (5,348,432).

Noro et al. discloses an electrical cable (Figures 1-3) comprising a flexible sheath having first and second ends, multiple conductors embedded in the sheath, for each conductor, first and second electrical contacts in communication with the conductor, and for each conductor, a third electrical contact in communication with the conductor. Noro et al. also discloses the first and second contacts being exposed via a quick type connector.

7. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Balzano (5,691,509).

Balzano discloses an electronic device comprising a cable (Figures 1-3) comprising a flexible sheath having first and second ends, multiple conductors embedded in the sheath, for each conductor, first and second electrical contact (15) in communication with the conductor, for each conductor, a third electrical contact

(col. 2, lines 21-25) in communication with the conductor, and a component coupled to the third contacts (not shown).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Balzano.

Maeda discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the first and second contacts being positioned on the same side of the sheath, being positioned within less than about 3 mm from each other, and being formed from a single pad. Balzano discloses first and second contacts (15) being positioned on the same side of the sheath. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the first and second contacts of Maeda on the same side of the sheath to make electrical connect to only one side of the cable as taught by Balzano. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to choose suitable distance between the first and second contacts of Maeda to meet the specific use of the

resulting device since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 205 USPQ 233. It would also have been obvious to one skilled in the art to form the first and second contacts of Maeda from a single pad, etc. providing a larger contact pad 54 on one side of the sheath and not providing a contact pad on the other side of the sheath, when electrical connection is made to only one side of the cable since it has been held that forming in one-piece article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau N Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Chau N Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2831